



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,536	01/16/2002	Bing R. Hsieh	110250	7727
27074	7590	10/13/2005	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			YAN, REN LUO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2854	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/683,536	HSIEH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ren L. Yan	2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 13-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 13-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 8, 10, 18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al(5,790,211) in view of Shibahara et al(2001/0028475).

The patent to Seachman et al teaches the structure of an imaging device as claimed including a platen 4 having a surface upon which an original document 5 is placed, a light source 2 located on a side of the plate opposite the surface upon which the original document is placed, and a platen cover 6 for covering the document during the document scanning operation, wherein the platen cover 6 comprises a substrate 7 having a dark color surface 8 facing the surface of the platen 4. See Fig. 1 and column 3, lines 9-23 in Seachman et al for details. However, Seachman et al do not teach to use a fluorescent coating on the platen cover wherein the fluorescent coating fluoresces or emits light in response to exposure to a light source. Shibahara et al teach in a similar imaging device the conventional use of a transparent fluorescent coating for producing infrared fluorescence in response to a light source provided on the sheet pushing surface of a platen cover. See paragraph [0013] in Shibahara et al for example. In view of the teaching of Shibahara et al, it would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, with a fluorescent coating for producing infrared

Art Unit: 2854

fluorescence in response to a light source in order to achieve higher light reflectance and to improve printing quality. With respect to claim 20, since the imaging device of Seachman et al is the same type as that of the present invention, it follows that the broadly recited photoreceptor upon which an electrostatic latent image is to be formed and one or more developing stations for developing the electrostatic latent image are inherent structural components of the imaging device of Seachman et al.

Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Shibahara et al as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Thomson et al(4,916,483). Seachman et al, as modified by Washio et al teach all that is claimed except for the platen cover being made of a plastic material. Thomson et al teach in a similar imaging device the use of a platen cover made of a plastic material. See column 3, lines 41-53 in Thomson et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, as modified by Shibahara et al made of a plastic material through injection molding as taught by Thomson et al for the ease of manufacture.

Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Shibahara et al and Thomson et al as applied to claims 3 and 13 above, and further in view of Deneau(4,157,412). The applied prior art teach all that is claimed except that the type of pigment for forming the dark color platen cover surface is not disclosed. Deneau teaches the use of well known carbon black as a pigment of a dark color. See column 4, lines 17-26 in Deneau for example. In view of the teaching of Deneau, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, as modified by the

Art Unit: 2854

applied prior art with carbon black as the pigment choice to form the dark color surface of the platen cover.

Claims 5-7 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Shibahara et al as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Hayashi et al(6,840,647). Seachman et al, as modified by Shibahara et al, teach all that is claimed except that the material used for the light-emitting fluorescent coating is not disclosed. Hayashi et al teach in a light device having a liquid crystal polymer film the conventional use of a light-emitting polymer of a polyvinylenphenylene or derivatives containing a fluorescent pigment. See Table 1 in column 20 of Hayashi et al for example. It would have been obvious to those having ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover of Seachman et al, as modified by Shibahara et al, with a light-emitting polymer coating containing the fluorescent pigment as taught by Hayashi et al in order to achieve the high light reflectance effect as desired.

Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seachman et al in view of Shibahara et al as applied to claims 1 and 21 above, and further in view of Tuhro(5,017,963). Seachman et al, as modified by Shibahara et al teach all that is claimed except for the substrate includes a regular pattern of white color spots. Tuhro teaches in a similar imaging device including a platen cover 350 having a surface 352 which is provided with a printed pattern containing white color spots. See Fig. 4B and column 6, lines 27-36 in Tuhro for example. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the platen cover surface of Seachman et al, as modified by Shibahara et al with the fluorescent coating and a printed pattern containing white color spots as taught by Tuhro since Shibahara et al do teach to cover the platen cover surface with a transparent fluorescent coating.

Art Unit: 2854

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ren L. Yan whose telephone number is 571-272-2173. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on 571-272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2854

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ren L Yan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854

Ren Yan
Oct. 6, 2005